arXiv:1704.03066v1 [math.CO] 10 Apr 2017

New Properties of Numbers of Plane Graphs*

Siddharth Prasad†

Abstract

We explore various techniques for counting the number of straight-edge crossing-free graphs that can be embedded over a planar point set. In particular, we derive a lower bound on the number of such graphs with $m+1$ edges with respect to the number of graphs with m edges. We show how a relatively small improvement of this bound would improve existing bounds concerning numbers of plane graphs. Furthermore, we use a cross-graph charging scheme to derive lower bounds for the number of such graphs when the convex hull of the point set is small.

1 Introduction

A *straight-edge crossing-free* graph or a *plane graph* G is an embedding of a planar graph onto a planar point set S with edges that are straight-line segments that may only intersect at their endpoints. We say that a planar point set is in *general position* if no three points are collinear. In this paper all point sets will be assumed to be in general position. Given a set S of N points in the plane we are interested in questions of the form – what is the maximum/minimum number of straight-edge crossing-free graphs of type X that can be embedded over any specific set of N points in the plane?[1] In 1982 Ajtai et al. [2] showed that the number of plane graphs over any set of N points can never exceed a fixed exponential in N, and gave the first upper bound of 10^{13N}. Over the past decade, progressively smaller upper bounds have been derived (e.g., see [4, 7, 9, 10]). The number of plane graphs has also been studied from an algorithmic viewpoint. In 2011 Razen and Welzl [8] showed that computing the number of plane graphs on a given planar point set can be done exponentially faster than enumerating them, and in 2016 Marx and Miltzow [5] showed that the number of triangulations can be computed in sub-exponential time.

Work on the above class of problems has resulted in the development of several different combinatorial techniques. For example, the current best upper bound of $O(10.05^N)$ on the number of perfect matchings was proved by Sharir and Welzl [11] by considering a vertical decomposition of the plane and bounding the number of ways to add and remove an edge to an existing matching. Sharir and Sheffer [9] use a novel combinatorial technique called a *cross-graph charging scheme* to derive the best known bound of $O^*(187.53^N)$ for the number of plane graphs.[2] A charging scheme involves assigning charges to the vertices of a graph G, and then moving the charges between various vertices of G. The cross-graph charging scheme used in [9] involves moving charges between the vertices of different graphs over the same point set.

*Work on this paper was done as a part of the Summer Undergraduate Research Fellowships program at Caltech.

†Department of Mathematics, Caltech, Pasadena 91106, CA. *sprasad@caltech.edu*

[1] For a detailed list of up-to-date bounds on the number of different types of plane graphs that can be embedded on a set of N points, see a dedicated webpage by Adam Sheffer: `https://adamsheffer.wordpress.com/numbers-of-plane-graphs/`

[2] In the notations $O^*()$, $\Theta^*()$, and $\Omega^*()$, we neglect polynomial factors.

Before we state our main results, we introduce some useful notation and give formal definitions of some recurring concepts that we will use throughout this paper.

Given a set S of N points in the plane define $\mathcal{P}(S)$ as the set of all plane graphs of S. Let $\mathsf{pg}(S) := |\mathcal{P}(S)|$, and let $\mathsf{pg}_m(S)$ denote the number of plane graphs of S with m edges. We write $m = cN$, for some $0 \leq c < 3$ (a plane graph on N vertices has at most $3N - 6$ edges). Let $\mathsf{pg}(N) = \max_{|S|=N} \mathsf{pg}(S)$ and $\mathsf{pg}_m(N) = \max_{|S|=N} \mathsf{pg}_m(S)$. We define the *increase rate* $r_c(S)$ of a point set S as the ratio $r_c = r_c(S) := \frac{\mathsf{pg}_{cN+1}(S)}{\mathsf{pg}_{cN}(S)}$. This measures the relative increase in the number of plane graphs when one more edge is allowed. Moreover, let $h = h(S)$ denote the size of the convex hull of S, and let $\mathsf{pg}_\triangle(N)$ be the minimum value of $\mathsf{pg}(S)$ taken over all sets of N points with a triangular convex hull ($h = 3$).

Our first result is a lower bound on r_c.

Theorem 1.1. *For every set S of N points in the plane with a convex hull of size h and $0 \leq c < 3$,*

$$r_c \geq \frac{(3-c)N - h - 3}{cN + 1}.$$

We show that a relatively small improvement of this bound is needed to improve bounds on $\mathsf{pg}_{cN}(N)$. We then compute $r_c(S)$ for a specific point set S and use this to show that our bound on r_c does not appear amenable for much improvement.

Our other result is a lower bound on the number of plane graphs with a triangular convex hull.

Theorem 1.2. $\mathsf{pg}_\triangle(N) = \Omega^*(12.92^N)$.

Our method relies on charging schemes between objects from different plane graphs over the same point set. Given a set S of N points in the plane, we consider the set $S \times \mathcal{P}(S)$ and call each of its elements a *ving* (*v*ertex *in* *g*raph). Intuitively, a ving is an instance of a vertex (a point of S) in a specific plane graph. Our charging schemes are between vings from different graphs (sharing a common vertex). Our lower bound for $\mathsf{pg}_\triangle(N)$ is not far off from the upper bound of $\mathsf{pg}_\triangle(N) = O^*(23.3^N)$ which we derive via a simple construction. In [1] Aichholzer et al. show that the number of plane graphs that can be embedded on a set of N points is minimized when the N points are in convex position. This leads us to conjecture that our construction, which consists of points in convex chain configuration, minimizes $\mathsf{pg}_\triangle(N)$.

2 Plane Graphs with a Prescribed Number of Edges

In this section we study the relation between the number of plane graphs with cN edges and the number of plane graphs with $cN + 1$ edges. We first give a lower bound on the increase rate r_c for every set S of N points, and outline how this can be used to derive bounds on $\mathsf{pg}_{cN}(N)$. We then compute r_c explicitly for a specific configuration of points. Comparing the two results indicates that our bound on r_c cannot be improved significantly, though only a small improvement is needed to improve bounds on $\mathsf{pg}_{cN}(N)$.

2.1 Bounding the Increase Rate

We seek a bound of the form $r_c \geq g(c)$ where g is a rational function of c. The following theorem by Hoffmann et al. [4] gives a formula to get upper bounds for $\mathsf{pg}_{cN}(S)$.

Theorem 2.1. *For every set S of N points in the plane and $0 \leq c < 3$,*

$$\mathsf{pg}_{cN}(S) = O^*(B(c)^N) \cdot \mathsf{tr}(S),$$

where

$$B(c) := \frac{5^{5/2}}{8(c+t-1/2)^{c+t-1/2}(3-c-t)^{3-c-t}(2t)^t(1/2-t)^{1/2-t}},$$

and

$$t = \frac{1}{2}\left(\sqrt{(7/2)^2+3c+c^2} - 5/2 - c\right).$$

Here, $\mathsf{tr}(S)$ denotes the number of triangulations that can be embedded on S, for which the current best upper bound is 30^N due to Sharir and Sheffer [10]. Suppose for some fixed c we get the bound $\mathsf{pg}_{cN}(S) = O^*(\alpha^N)$ from the above formula. If $r_c \geq g(c)$, or equivalently $\mathsf{pg}_{cN+1}(S) \geq g(c)\mathsf{pg}_{cN}(S)$, then we have

$$\mathsf{pg}_{(c-\delta)N}(S) \leq \max_{\lambda\in[c-\delta,c]} g(\lambda)^{-\delta N} \cdot O^*(\alpha^N), \tag{1}$$

for some parameter δ.[3] Thus, improving the bound on r_c improves the bound on $\mathsf{pg}_{cN}(S)$ derived in this manner.

We now establish our lower bound on r_c (Theorem 1.1 from the introduction). We restate the theorem for the convenience of the reader.

Theorem 1.1. *For every set S of N points in the plane with a convex hull of size h and $0 \leq c < 3$,*

$$r_c \geq \frac{(3-c)N-h-3}{cN+1}.$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ be the sets of all plane graphs with cN edges and $cN+1$ edges on S, respectively. We construct a bipartite graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ on $\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{Y}$ as follows: For every plane graph $G \in \mathcal{Y}$ we connect G to every $G' \in \mathcal{X}$ that can be obtained by removing a single edge from G. Note that the degree of any $G \in \mathcal{Y}$ is the number of edges available for removal, which is $cN+1$. Similarly, the degree of any $G \in \mathcal{X}$ is the number of ways we can add a single edge e to G such that $G \cup \{e\}$ is also a plane graph. We obtain a lower bound for the degree of any $G \in \mathcal{X}$ by completing G to an arbitrary triangulation T, which by Euler's formula contains $3N-3-h$ edges. Since G has cN edges, $T \setminus G$ contains $3N-3-h-cN$ edges, so at least $3N-3-h-cN$ edges can be added to G. Thus,

$$((3-c)N-3-h)\underbrace{|\mathcal{X}|}_{\mathsf{pg}_{cN}(S)} \leq |\mathcal{E}| = (cN+1)\underbrace{|\mathcal{Y}|}_{\mathsf{pg}_{cN+1}(S)},$$

so we get

$$r_c \geq \frac{(3-c)N-h-3}{cN+1}.$$

□

If h is a small constant, we can use the inequality $r_c \geq \frac{3-c}{c}$ in (1), since $\frac{3-c}{c} - \frac{(3-c)N-h-3}{cN+1} = o(1)$, which is hidden by $O^*()$. Then, combining Theorem 1.1 with (1) allows us to derive bounds on $\mathsf{pg}_{cN}(N)$, but this method produces bounds that are slightly weaker than Theorem 2.1. For example, when $c = 2/3$, Theorem 2.1 gives $\mathsf{pg}_{cN}(N) = O^*(114.4^N)$ while our method gives $\mathsf{pg}_{cN}(N) = O^*(116.4^N)$. However, only a small improvement is needed in our bound for r_c to give better bounds for $\mathsf{pg}_{cN}(N)$ (for example $r_c \geq \frac{3.5-c}{c}$ already gives stronger bounds for $\mathsf{pg}_{cN}(N)$ than Theorem 2.1).

[3] To get a more accurate inequality, the factor of $(\max g)^{-\delta N}$ in (1) should be replaced with the product integral of g over $[c-\delta, c]$, but this has a negligible impact on the final bound.

2.2 Convex Chain Configuration

In this section we present a construction which indicates that our bound in Theorem 1.1 cannot be significantly improved. The point set S shall consist of $N-1$ points arranged on a semicircle and an additional point v positioned sufficiently high above to form a triangular convex hull (see Figure 1). This is known as *convex chain configuration*. Note that the condition on v implies that an edge from v to any point does not pass through the convex chain formed by the remaining points. We choose this configuration due to the fact that for N points the number of plane graphs is minimized when they are in convex position [1].



Figure 1: Points in convex chain configuration with all possible edges drawn. Type 1 edges are dotted, Type 2 edges are solid, and Type 3 edges are dashed.

We now compute $\mathsf{pg}_{cN}(S)$, and use this to compute $r_c(S)$.

Lemma 2.2. *For every set S of N points in convex chain configuration,*

$$\mathsf{pg}_{cN}(S) = O^*(\tilde{f}(c, \tfrac{1}{4}(-1+\sqrt{8c+1}))^N),$$

where

$$\tilde{f}(c,d) := \frac{4(1+d)^{1+d}}{(1-d)^{1-d}d^{2d}(c-d)^{c-d}(2-c+d)^{2-c+d}}.$$

Moreover, $\mathsf{pg}(S) = O^*(23.3^N)$.

Proof. To compute $\mathsf{pg}_{cN}(S)$ we characterize edges into three types (see Figure 1):

- Type 1: edges between two consecutive vertices on the convex chain (this includes the bottom edge).
- Type 2: edges between two non-consecutive vertices on the convex chain.
- Type 3: edges adjacent to the topmost vertex v.

In [6] the following formula is given for the number of ways to choose M non-intersecting diagonals from the interior of a convex N-gon:

$$\frac{1}{M+1}\binom{N-3}{M}\binom{N+M-1}{M}.$$

This counts exactly the number of ways to choose M non-crossing Type 2 edges. Note that there are exactly $N-1$ Type 1 edges and $N-1$ Type 3 edges, none of which intersect. Let $f(cN, dN)$ be the number of plane graphs with cN edges that can be drawn on S such that dN of the edges are of Type 2. We have

$$f(cN,dN) = \frac{1}{dN+1}\binom{N-3}{dN}\binom{(1-d)N-1}{dN}\binom{2N-2}{(c-d)N}.$$

We approximate $f(cN, dN)$ using Stirling's approximation $n! \sim \sqrt{2\pi n}(n/e)^n$. Since we are not concerned with sub-exponential factors, we use $n! = \Theta^*((n/e)^n)$. Thus we may approximate the binomial coefficient $\binom{n}{k}$ with

$$\binom{n}{k} = \frac{n!}{k!(n-k)!} = \Theta^*\left(\frac{(n/e)^n}{(k/e)^k((n-k)/e)^{n-k}}\right) = \Theta^*\left(\frac{n^n}{k^k(n-k)^{n-k}}\right).$$

Using this we get $f(cN, dN) = \Theta^*((\tilde{f}(c,d))^N)$, where

$$\tilde{f}(c,d) = \frac{4(1+d)^{1+d}}{(1-d)^{1-d}d^{2d}(c-d)^{c-d}(2-c+d)^{2-c+d}}.$$

Differentiating $\tilde{f}$ with respect to d yields

$$\tilde{f}_d = \frac{4(1+d)^{1+d}}{(1-d)^{1-d}d^{2d}(c-d)^{c-d}(2-c+d)^{2-c+d}} \cdot \log\frac{(1-d)(1+d)(c-d)}{d^2(2-c+d)}.$$

The first term on the right hand side is always positive, and the natural logarithm is 0 exactly when $d = \frac{1}{4}(-1 \pm \sqrt{8c+1})$. A tedious computation shows that the second derivative $\tilde{f}_{dd}$ evaluated at $d = \frac{1}{4}(-1 \pm \sqrt{8c+1})$ is negative, so this is a maximum for $\tilde{f}$. A similar computation yields that $\tilde{f}(c, \frac{1}{4}(-1+\sqrt{8c+1}))$ attains a maximum of 23.3 at $c \approx 1.7$. Thus, $\mathsf{pg}_{cN}(S) = O^*(\tilde{f}(c, \frac{1}{4}(-1+\sqrt{8c+1}))^N)$, and in particular $\mathsf{pg}(S) = O^*(23.3^N)$. □

We will revisit this bound in the next section, where we deal with this configuration in a slightly different setting. We now compute the increase rate r_c for this configuration. Suppose the additional edge is Type 2. Then,

$$r_c = \frac{f(dN+1, cN+1)}{f(dN, cN)} = \frac{(dN+N)(N-dN-3)}{(dN+1)(dN+2)} \overset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} \frac{1-d^2}{d^2}.$$

If the additional edge is Type 1 or Type 3 we have

$$r_c = \frac{f(dN, cN+1)}{f(dN, cN)} = \frac{(2-c+d)N-2}{(c-d)N+1} \overset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} \frac{2-c+d}{c-d}.$$

At $d = \frac{1}{4}(-1 \pm \sqrt{8c+1})$, both ratios evaluate to $r_c = \frac{-4c+\sqrt{1+8c}+7}{4c-\sqrt{1+8c}+1}$. However, this increase rate is not significantly greater than what our bound predicts, which indicates that our bound cannot be improved drastically (see Table 1).

c	$r_c(S)$, S in convex chain configuration	Lower bound predicted by Theorem 1.1
2/3	5.96	3.5
1	3	2
4/3	1.74	1.25
5/3	1.06	0.8

Table 1: Comparison of increase rate for convex chain configuration to the bound of Theorem 1.1

3 Plane Graphs with a Triangular Convex Hull

In this section we derive lower bounds on the number of plane graphs with a triangular convex hull using a cross-graph charging scheme in the same spirit as [9]. In [1] Aichholzer et al. show that the number of plane graphs that can be embedded on a set of N points is minimized when the N points are in convex position. In [3] Flajolet and Noy show that this number is $\Theta((6+4\sqrt{2})^N) \approx \Theta(11.65^N)$. Thus, every set of N points has $\Omega(11.65^N)$ plane graphs, and to the best of our knowledge this is also the best known lower bound for sets with a triangular convex hull. Let $\mathsf{pg}_\triangle(N)$ be the minimum value of $\mathsf{pg}(S)$ taken over all sets S of N points with a triangular convex hull. Lemma 2.2 gives us the upper bound $\mathsf{pg}_\triangle(N) = O^*(23.3^N)$. For the remainder of this section all point sets will be assumed to have a triangular convex hull.

3.1 Setup

Given two vertices p, q of a plane graph G, we say that p *sees* q in G if the (straight) edge pq does not cross any edge of G. The *degree* of a ving (p, G) is the degree of p in G; a ving of degree i is called an *i-ving*. We say that a ving $v = (p, G)$ is an *x-ving* if it satisfies the following properties:

1. We cannot increase the degree of p by inserting additional (straight) edges to G (that is, p cannot see any vertex that is not connected to it in G).
2. p is not in the convex hull of G.

We say that an x-ving $v = (p, G)$ is an x_i-ving if v is also an i-ving. Note that every x-ving has degree at least 3. We say that a ving $u = (p, G')$ *corresponds* to the x-ving $v = (p, G)$ if G is obtained by inserting into G' all the edges that connect p to the points that it sees in G' (and are not already in the graph). Notice that every ving corresponds to a unique x-ving. Given a plane graph $G \in \mathcal{P}(S)$, we denote by $v_i(G)$ the number of i-vings in G, for $i \geq 0$, and by $v_x(G)$ the number of x-vings in G. Finally, the expected value of $v_x(G)$, for a graph chosen uniformly at random from $\mathcal{P}(S)$, is denoted as $\hat{v}_x(S)$. More formally, $\hat{v}_x = \hat{v}_x(S) := \mathbb{E}\{v_x(G)\} = \dfrac{\sum_{G\in\mathcal{P}(S)} v_x(G)}{\mathsf{pg}(S)}$. A similar notation, $\hat{v}_i(S)$, applies to the expected value of $v_i(G)$.

The following lemma, whose proof is similar to that of Lemma 2.1 in [9], gives us a relation between $\hat{v}_x$ and $\mathsf{pg}_\triangle(N)$.

Lemma 3.1. *For $N \geq 3$, let $C > 0$ be a real number such that $\hat{v}_x(S) \leq C(N-3)$ holds for every set S of N points in the plane with a triangular convex hull. Then $\mathsf{pg}_\triangle(N) \geq \frac{1}{C}\mathsf{pg}_\triangle(N-1)$.*

Proof. Let S be a set that minimizes $\mathsf{pg}(S)$ among all sets of N points in the plane with triangular convex hull. Then, we can obtain certain plane graphs of S by choosing a point $q \in S$ that is not in the convex hull of S and a plane graph G of $S \setminus \{q\}$, inserting q into G, and then connecting q to all the vertices that it can see in G. It is then clear that a plane graph G of S can be obtained in exactly $v_x(G)$ ways in this manner. Thus,

$$\hat{v}_x \cdot \mathsf{pg}(S) = \sum_{G\in\mathcal{P}(S)} v_x(G) = \sum_{q\in S} \mathsf{pg}(S \setminus \{q\}).$$

The leftmost expression equals $\hat{v}_x \cdot \mathsf{pg}_\triangle(N)$, and the rightmost expression is at least $(N-3)\cdot\mathsf{pg}_\triangle(N-1)$. Hence, with $\hat{v}_x \leq C(N-3)$, we have $\mathsf{pg}_\triangle(N) = \mathsf{pg}(S) \geq \frac{N-3}{\hat{v}_x} \cdot \mathsf{pg}_\triangle(N-1) \geq \frac{1}{C} \cdot \mathsf{pg}_\triangle(N-1)$. □

3.2 Charging Scheme

To get upper bounds for $\hat{v}_x$, we use a charging scheme that gives a unit of charge to every x-ving, and then moves charge from x-vings to higher degree x-vings. We say an x_i-ving $v = (p, G)$ *reduces to* an x_j-ving $v' = (p, G')$ for $j > i$ if we can obtain v' by removing one edge from G, and then connecting p to all newly visible vertices (see Figure 2).



Figure 2: x_4-ving with vertex p that reduces to the x_5-ving with vertex p obtained by deleting edge ac, and then connecting p to the visible vertex b.

Note that x-vings $v = (p, G)$ that do not reduce to any higher degree x-vings must be adjacent to every vertex of G. We may deduce that in any plane graph G there is at most one such x-ving v. This is because v must be adjacent to the three hull vertices of G. Every other point u is in one of the three triangles determined by v and two hull vertices, which means that u can see at most two hull vertices. Since v is the only point that can be adjacent to all the hull vertices, every G has at most one x-ving that does not reduce to any higher degree x-vings.

We now derive our first bound for $\hat{v}_x$.

Lemma 3.2. *For every set S of N points in the plane, $\hat{v}_x(S) \leq \frac{N-3}{12.38}$.*

Proof. Consider a set S of N points. We start by giving a unit charge to every x-ving of every plane graph embedded over S. Fix a positive integer M. For each x_3-ving, we move c_3 units of charge to one of the higher degree x-vings it reduces to. For each x_4-ving, we then move c_4 units of charge to one of the higher degree x-vings it reduces to. We continue this process for x_i-vings for each $i < M$. If an x_i-ving reduces to multiple higher degree x-vings, we arbitrarily choose one. Finally, each x_i-ving (for each $i < N$) redistributes its charge evenly to the 2^i lower degree vings that correspond to it.

If we show that every ving receives a charge of at most t units after redistribution, then we would have

$$\hat{v}_x \mathsf{pg}(S) = \sum_{G \in \mathcal{P}(S)} v_x(G) = \text{total charge} \leq (N-3)t \cdot \mathsf{pg}(S),$$

since none of the vings which are hull vertices receive any charge. This would then lead to the bound $\hat{v}_x \leq (N-3)t$.

For $3 \leq i \leq M$ let $\mathrm{ch}(i)$ denote the maximum possible charge that any x_i-ving can hold before the redistribution step. For an x_i-ving $v = (p, G)$, let $N(v)$ denote the set of vertices that are connected to v by an edge in G. For any two vertices $a, b \in N(v)$ define their distance $d(a, b)$ to be the number of edges adjacent to v that intersect the edge ab. For example, in Figure 3, $d(a, b) = 2$.

Note that drawing the edge ab and removing the edges it intersects gives an $x_{i-d(a,b)}$-ving that reduces to v. For example, in Figure 3, the x_7-ving v is charged by the x_5-ving obtained by drawing ab and removing the edges it intersects.



Figure 3: Example of an x_7-ving that is charged by the x_5-ving obtained by drawing the edge ab with $d(a,b) = 2$.

For $j < i$, the number of x_j-vings that reduce to v is at most i, so we immediately get the bound $\mathrm{ch}(i) \leq 1 + ic_{i-1} + ic_{i-2} + \cdots + ic_3 - c_i$. However, in this bound for $\mathrm{ch}(i)$ we are overcounting the number of x-vings that can reduce to v. Note that if there are k x_j-vings that reduce to v, where $j = i - \ell$ for some distance $\ell \neq i/2 - 1$, then there are k pairs of vertices $(a,b) \in N(v) \times N(v)$ such that $d(a,b) = \ell$. This means that there can be at most $i - k$ pairs of vertices in $N(v) \times N(v)$ with distance $i - \ell - 2$, so at most $i - k$ $x_{\ell+2}$-vings reduce to v. If i is even, then there are at most $i/2$ pairs of neighbors of v that are at a distance of $i/2 - 1$. Thus, the number of $x_{i/2+1}$=vings that reduce to v is at most $i/2$. Note that these observations are independent of the relative position of v in the interior of the convex hull of $N(v)$.

We combine the above observations to arrive at our first bounds for $\mathrm{ch}(i)$. The analysis for x_3-vings and x_4-vings is straightforward: At most two x_3-vings can reduce to a given x_4-ving, so $\mathrm{ch}(3) \leq 1 - c_3$ and $\mathrm{ch}(4) \leq 1 + 2c_3 - c_4$. If $5 \leq i < M$ is odd we have

$$\mathrm{ch}(i) \leq 1 + i \sum_{\ell=1}^{(i-3)/2} \max(c_{i-\ell}, c_{\ell+2}) - c_i,$$

and if i is even we have

$$\mathrm{ch}(i) \leq 1 + i \sum_{\ell=1}^{(i-4)/2} \max(c_{i-\ell}, c_{\ell+2}) + \frac{i}{2} c_{i/2+1} - c_i.$$

Based on whether M is even or odd $\mathrm{ch}(M)$ will be identical to one of the inequalities above barring the loss of c_M units of charge.

Choosing $M = 10$ and choosing $c_3 = 0.354088$, $c_4 = 0.416354$, $c_5 = 0.498397$, $c_6 = 0.875507$, $c_7 = 0.427486$, $c_8 = 0.516668$, and $c_9 = 0.504267$ (found by a Mathematica computation), we get that the minimum value of the expression $\max(\mathrm{ch}(3)/2^3, \ldots, \mathrm{ch}(9)/2^9)$ is 0.080738, which has a reciprocal value of 12.38. We conclude that the average value of v_x is at most $\frac{N-3}{12.38}$. □

Combining Lemmas 3.2 and 3.1 and using an obvious induction on N (starting with the constant value $\mathsf{pg}_\triangle(11)$), we obtain

Theorem 3.3. $\mathsf{pg}_\triangle(N) = \Omega^*(12.38^N)$.

3.3 Improvements

In coming up with a bound for $\mathrm{ch}(i)$ that works for every i we were unable to take into account some more subtle properties of low degree x-vings. We now derive an improved bound, by studying $\mathrm{ch}(5)$ more carefully.

Lemma 3.4. *For every set S of N points in the plane, $\hat{v}_x(S) \leq \frac{N-3}{12.92}$.*

Proof. The main structure of the previous charging scheme still applies to this lemma, but we will treat x_5-vings separately. For an x_5-ving v, let P_v denote the pentagon formed by the five vertices of $N(v)$. We split up our analysis into cases based on the relative position of v with respect to the diagonals of P_v.



Figure 4: The number of x_3-vings and x_4-vings that can contribute charge to a given x_5-ving v is determined by the region of P_v that contains v.

In general, at most five x_4-vings can reduce to a given x_5-ving, and at most two x_3-vings can reduce to a given x_4-ving. Thus, our bound for ch(5) from the previous lemma allows for up to 10 x_3-vings to contribute charge to a given x_5-ving v. However, this overcounts the number of x-vings that can contribute charge to v. We divide the pentagon P_v into three regions X, Y, and Z that are determined by the diagonals of the pentagon (see Figure 4). Note that we only need to consider the case where P_v is a convex pentagon, since this maximizes the number of x-vings that can contribute charge to v. We then separately consider the cases where v lies in region X, Y, or Z and count the charge contribution to v from x_3-vings and x_4-vings in each case.

Suppose v lies in region X. In this case, there are at most five x_4-vings that reduce to v. The number of x_3-vings that can possibly contribute charge to v is at most the Catalan number $C_3 = 5$, which counts the number of triangulations of a regular pentagon. This is due to the one-to-one correspondence between triangulations of P_v and x_3-vings that contribute charge to v resulting from sending a triangulation T to the triangle containing v.

Suppose v lies in region Y. In this case, there are at most four x_4-vings that reduce to v. There are five x_3-vings that contribute charge to v by reducing to an x_4-ving that reduces to v; these arise from the triangulations of P_v. There is also one additional x_3-ving that directly reduces to v. This x_3-ving is obtained by adding one diagonal of P_v, rather than by triangulating it.

Suppose v lies in region Z. In this case, there are at most three x_4-vings that reduce to v. There are five x_3-vings that contribute charge to v by reducing to an x_4-ving that reduces to v; these arise from the triangulations of P_v. There are also two additional x_3-vings that directly reduce to v. These x_3-vings are obtained by adding one diagonal of P_v, rather than by triangulating it.

In each of the three cases above, we transfer the charge of all the x_3-vings and x_4-vings to the corresponding x_5-ving. Note that in every case this charge is at most $5 + 5 = 4 + 6 = 3 + 7 = 10$ units. The x_5-ving then transfers c_5 units of charge to a higher degree x-ving it reduces to. In the case where v is in X, we will redistribute the remaining charge to the $2^5 + 5 \cdot 2^4 + 5 \cdot 2^3$ vings that correspond to the x_5-ving or to the other x-vings whose charge was moved to the x_5-ving. In the case where v is in Y the number of these vings is $2^5 + 4 \cdot 2^4 + 6 \cdot 2^3$ and in the case where v is in Z the number of these vings is $2^5 + 3 \cdot 2^4 + 7 \cdot 2^3$.

Our charging scheme works in the same way as in Lemma 3.2 except for the modified analysis of x_5-vings and of the x-vings that contribute charge to them. Then, the maximum charge that

could end up on any of the vings that correspond to these x_3-vings, x_4-vings, and x_5-vings is $\max\left(\frac{1+5+5-c_5}{2^5+5\cdot 2^4+5\cdot 2^3}, \frac{1+4+6-c_5}{2^5+4\cdot 2^4+6\cdot 2^3}, \frac{1+3+7-c_5}{2^5+3\cdot 2^4+7\cdot 2^3}\right) = \frac{1+3+7-c_5}{2^5+3\cdot 2^4+7\cdot 2^3}$. In computing the maximum charge any ving could end up with, we simply replace the term $\mathrm{ch}(5)/2^5$ in the previous lemma with this maximum charge.

Choosing $M = 10$ and choosing $c_3 = 0.387173$, $c_4 = 0.539596$, $c_5 = 0.475561$, $c_6 = 0.519479$, $c_7 = 0.091004$, $c_8 = 1.767860$, and $c_9 = 0.690643$, (found by a Mathematica computation), we get that the minimum value of the expression

$$\max\left(\frac{\mathrm{ch}(3)}{2^3}, \frac{\mathrm{ch}(4)}{2^4}, \frac{1+3+7-c_5}{2^5+3\cdot 2^4+7\cdot 2^3}, \frac{\mathrm{ch}(6)}{2^6}, \ldots, \frac{\mathrm{ch}(9)}{2^9}\right)$$

is 0.077385, which has a reciprocal value of 12.92. We conclude that the average value of v_x is at most $\frac{N-3}{12.92}$ x-vings. □

Combining Lemmas 3.4 and 3.1 yields

Theorem 1.2. $\mathsf{pg}_{\triangle}(N) = \Omega^*(12.92^N)$.

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank Adam Sheffer for providing invaluable guidance on this project and the Caltech SFP office for supporting his work on this project.

References

[1] Aichholzer, O., Hackl, T., Huemer, C., Hurtado, F., Krasser, H., & Vogtenhuber, B. (2007). On the number of plane geometric graphs. Graphs and Combinatorics, 23(1), 67-84.

[2] Ajtai, M., Chvátal, V., Newborn, M. M., & Szemerédi, E. (1982). Crossing-free subgraphs. North-Holland Mathematics Studies, 60, 9-12.

[3] Flajolet, P., & Noy, M. (1999). Analytic combinatorics of non-crossing configurations. Discrete Mathematics, 204(1), 203-229.

[4] Hoffmann, M., Schulz, A., Sharir, M., Sheffer, A., Tóth, C. D., & Welzl, E. (2013). Counting plane graphs: flippability and its applications. In Thirty Essays on Geometric Graph Theory (pp. 303-325). Springer New York.

[5] Marx, D., & Miltzow, T. (2016). Peeling and nibbling the cactus: Subexponential-time algorithms for counting triangulations and related problems. arXiv preprint arXiv:1603.07340.

[6] Pak, I. (2008). Lectures on discrete and polyhedral geometry. Preliminary version available at author? web page.

[7] Razen, A., Snoeyink, J., & Welzl, E. (2008). Number of crossing-free geometric graphs vs. triangulations. Electronic Notes in Discrete Mathematics, 31, 195-200.

[8] Razen, A., & Welzl, E. (2011). Counting plane graphs with exponential speed-up. In Rainbow of computer science (pp. 36-46). Springer Berlin Heidelberg.

[9] Sharir, M., & Sheffer, A. (2013). Counting plane graphs: cross-graph charging schemes. Combinatorics, Probability and Computing, 22(06), 935-954.

[10] Sharir, M., & Sheffer, A. (2011). Counting triangulations of planar point sets. Electr. J. Comb, 18(1), P70.

[11] Sharir, M., & Welzl, E. (2006). On the number of crossing-free matchings, cycles, and partitions. SIAM Journal on Computing, 36(3), 695-720.

[12] Sharir, M., Sheffer, A., & Welzl, E. (2011). On degrees in random triangulations of point sets. Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A, 118(7), 1979-1999.